(10)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT JABALPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 3948 /2000.
(WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION ON INDIA)

PETITIONERS:

1. Smt. Ganeshiabai
   D/o Bisahu Satnami

2. Smt.Surjotibai
   D/o late Bihasu satnami

3. Nandlal S/o Gokul

4. Nandu S/o Gokul

5. Gulab S/o Tularam

6. Makhan S/o Ramsingh

7. Manrakhan S/o Ramsingh

8. Shatrughan S/o Chandu

9. Santu S/o Chandu

10. Smt. Puniyabai Wd/o Chandu

11. Ramkishun S/o Shivprasad

12. Ladgu S/o Bhikhari

13. Smt. Kondibai Wd/o Bhikhari

14. Lilchand S/o Pachkaud

15. Devi Prasad S/o Atmaram

16. Smt. Nona Wd/o Samaydas

All 1 to 16 resident of village-
Doma, Tahsil & Distt.Raipur(MP).

17. Mannu S/o Misir Satnami

18. Lakhanlal S/o Misir Satnami

19. Ramcharan S/o Misir Satnami

17 to 19 resident of village-
Chhachhanperi, tahsil and
Distt. Raipur (MP).

//Versus//

RESPONDENTS:

1. State of Madhya pradesh
   through- Secretary-
   Revenue Department Mantralaya
   Vallabh Bhawan, BHOPAL(MP).

2. The Collector, Raipur (MP).

3. The Sub-Divisional Officer,
   Raipur (MP).

4. Tahsildar, Raipur (MP).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION ON INDIA

GRPI-132-35L.-11-99

II-156
C.J.

Order Sheet [Contd]

3948/2000

Case No. 3938 of 19 .....
~~2137~~ xx 2000

Date of Order or Proceeding	Order or proceeding with Signature of Presiding Officer	Signature of parties or Pleaders where necessary
	15.1.2001 : Mr. Alok Aradhe for the petitioner. Dr.N.K.Shukla, Dy.AG for the respondent. The only grievance of the writ petitioner is that despite final orders passed by the Board of Revenue dt. 4.4.98 vide annexure P-1 the respondent no.4 Tehsil Dar is yet to carry-out the said order by mutating the names of the petitioners in the relevant revenue records. After hearing the counsel for the parties and on perusal of relevant documents placed before me I am of the view that the order passed by the Board of Revenue has indeed attained finality. Therefore, the said order must have its effect. ~~Though~~ It is submitted that this court may not issue a direction to the respondent to execute the order passed by Board of Revenue in as much as this court is not an executing court. This submission is made on the ground that Board of Revenue is a competent authority before whom the writ petitioner should have gone with his grievance, that certain authority has failed to carry-out the order issued by board of revenue. I am of the view that as of now there is no issue for	

..2

Date of order or Proceeding	Order or Proceeding With signature of Presiding Officer ..2..	Signature of Parties or Pleaders where necessary

consideration by any competent authority in this regard, as much as the issue was already settled by the Board of Revenue. It is but natural that final order should be executed ex. I direct respondent no.4 Tehsildar Raipur to carry-out the order of Board of Revenue, meticulously within two weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

With the aforesaid directions, the petition is disposed of.

C.c. on payment.

Sd/-
Chief Justice